

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

IVERY MAYS,

Plaintiff,

v.

**UNITED ASSOCIATION OF
JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF
THE PLUMBING AND PIPEFITTING
INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES
AND CANADA, LOCAL 290**, an Oregon local
labor organization; **UNITED ASSOCIATION
LOCAL 290 APPRENTICESHIP AND
JOURNEYMEN TRAINING TRUST FUND
AKA LOCAL 290 TRAINING CENTER**, an
Oregon apprenticeship program; and **CLARE
SHROPSHIRE**, an individual,

Defendants.

No. 3:16-cv-00914-AC

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On August 8, 2017, Magistrate Judge Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [52], recommending that the Training Center Defendants' motion for Leave to Amend [26] should be GRANTED. No objection was filed.

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge,

but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Acosta's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [52] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8th day of September, 2017.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge